```
Page 1
 1
                         UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2
                        WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
 3
                                  AT SEATTLE
 4
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et )
 8
                      al., ) Case No.: C70-9213
                                   )Subproceeding No. 01-1 (Culverts)
10
                     Plaintiffs,
11
        vs.
   STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al., )
13
                       Defendants. )
14
15
16
                     DEPOSITION UPON ORAL EXAMINATION OF
17
                                RUSS LADLEY
18
19
                               April 25, 2006
20
                                  9:30 a.m.
                             801 Second Avenue
21
                             Seattle, Washington
22
23
24
                         Carl T. Beck, Court Reporter
25
                                   CCR 2952
```

Page 44 believe, and the Sportsmen's --excuse me, 7 and 8 --1 2 Restoration Sites 7 and 8. Q And they were -- just looking in the far-right column on 3 page three of Exhibit 5, those were ranked third and 5 thirteenth, respectively? A Correct. Q Do you know who provided the funding for these projects? 8 A The Puyallup provided some of it. The bulk was through Salmon Recovery Funding Board monies. I think the County 10 and the Conservation District also threw in some money. 11 Q Were there any culvert repair projects listed in this 12 proposed Restoration Catalog? 13 A Well, both these involve culvert repairs, if that's what 14 you're getting at. 15 Okay. Both 6 and 7 did? 16 A No. Both 7 and 8. 17 Q Or 7 and 8, rather. Okay. Were there any others that did? 18 Yes. 19 O Which ones? 20 A No. 3, Freeman Road; No. 2, Oxbow. I believe that's it. 21 Q And when you say these particular restoration projects 22 involved culvert repairs, were they the exclusive focus of 23 the repair or were they part of other activities that were 24 proposed? 25 A In this case, they were, I believe, the exclusive focus of

Page 45 1 the work. Q For the Oxbow Wetland Property, Restoration Site 2, do you know who owned that culvert? A That's been a question for -- that's been debated for quite 5 awhile. I don't know who owns it. Q Who's debated the question of who owns it? A Pierce County and the Puyallup Tribe have debated it. Q And who do you think the owner is, or who does the Tribe 8 think the owner is? A The County owns and maintains the levee. I would assume 10 they own the Oxbow, but they've thus far denied that 11 12 relationship. 13 Q So the County says it's the Tribe's? 14 They say they don't know who owns it. Q And in terms of the Freeman Road, No. 3 -- Project No. 3 --15 16 do you know who owns that culvert? A You know, I'm not sure that is even a culvert there anymore. 17 18 Q You also mentioned Project numbers 7 and 8. No. 7 is the 19 Sportsmen's Club Wetland. 20 Do you know what road or whose road and culvert would 21 be involved in that project? 22 A Well, it's my understanding it's a County levee, and they 23 have an easement over -- or through the Sportsmen's Club's 24 property. 25 Q So the Sportsmen's Club owns the property?

Page 46 They own the property. 1 2 Q And the County has an easement? A Correct. That's my understanding. 3 Q For the 96th Street Wetland, that's Project No. 8, do you 4 know who owns the road and the culvert that's blocking for that particular project? A Yeah. In this case, it's not actually a road. It's just a levee, and it's a County levee. O The introductory pages -- or the introduction on page one seems to focus on a problem of channelization on the 10 Puyallup River. 11 My understanding is that channelization would restrict 12 the flow of a river into a main channel and then eliminate 13 14 its ability to spread out into side channels. Is that a fair --15 A That is fair to say. 16 Q The report seems to indicate that there are over 45 miles of 17 levees on the Puyallup, White, and Carbon Rivers. Has that 18 number changed since this catalog was prepared in 1999? 19 A It has not. I would emphasize the fact that the 45 miles 20 21 could be construed as 90 miles, though, because it's levees on both sides of the river. 22 23 Q Okay. 24 A If that makes sense. Q Uh-huh. Yes. 25

Page 53 publication called HighCountry News, and the first few 1 paragraphs discuss a particular location where you point out 2 a culvert to a reporter. Do you recall doing this? A Yeah. I think I do recollect it now. Q Do you remember where this particular culvert is? A Yeah. It's a culvert tidegate, lower Puyallup River. Q What's a "tidegate"? A It's a culvert that has a swing plate on it to restrict flow 9 to one direction. 10 Q And where specifically was this culvert located? 11 A This is Restoration Site No. 2, the Oxbow Wetland Property, river mile 4.8. 12 13 Q And if I'm not mistaken, you mentioned that this was 14 involving a levee, and there was an ownership dispute 15 between Pierce County and the Tribe as to who was 16 responsible for this --17 A I would also interject that Fife could be one of the owners. 18 Q And can you tell me what particular species use the stream 19 where this particular culvert is located? 20 We really don't know since it's been there for so long. 21 How did you become aware of it? 22 A Floating down the river in a boat one day, we could see the 23 tidegate from the river. 24 Q Has this particular culvert been repaired yet? 25 A No. It has not.

```
Page 54
 1
       Q In terms of the Puyallup Tribe's priority for repairing this
          particular culvert, it appears from Exhibit 5 that it was
          ranked 11th among the 13 projects that you identified. Is
 3
          that consistent with how you still view the priority of this
          project?
       A The priority has changed.
       Q How has it changed?
       A At the time of the catalog, it was undeveloped Oxbow Lake.
        And what is it now?
10
         It's rapidly becoming a lake surrounded by 900 homes.
11
       Q So would I understand correctly that because development is
12
          encroaching in this area, that its priority has been reduced
          substantially?
13
14
       A It may change. Its priority may change.
15
       Q Have you -- I assume that you've communicated with the
16
          County or the City of Fife regarding this particular
17
          culvert?
18
       A We have.
19
       Q And what response did they have?
20
       A They are very concerned about flood liability with the
21
          tidegate: any alterations, who assumes the liability.
22
       Q Is there another tidegate of concern to the Puyallup Tribe
23
          at Clear Creek beneath State Route 167?
24
       A Yes, there is.
25
       Q What's that situation about?
```

Page 86 1 A Yeah, I don't. Q Do you know whether there are any State-owed culverts that 2 affect the operation of Puyallup Tribal hatcheries? A State owned, no. Q Are there privately owned --A Yes. 7 Q -- that affect? Are there County or City culverts that affect? A Yes. 10 Q Do you know approximately how many or where they're located? A Diru Creek there's three affecting the hatchery. 11 12 O And how about Clarks Creek? 13 A No culverts affect that. Q Do the Diru Creek culverts affect the amount of salmon 14 15 returning to the hatcheries? 16 A They do. 17 Q And again, those are not State-owned culverts? 18 A Correct. Q The Tribes have admitted in prior Discovery in this case 19 20 that State-owned culverts which block fish passenge are not 21 the only cause for reductions in the amount of the 22 anadromous fish that would otherwise return to pass through the Tribes' Usual and Accustomed areas. 23 24 Do you agree that there are other reasons beside State-25 owned culverts that some salmon stocks aren't doing better?

Page 95 1 CERTIFICATE 2 STATE OF WASHINGTON) 3 SS COUNTY OF KING I, Carl T. Beck, a Notary Public in and for the State 6 of Washington hereby certify: 7 That the foregoing deposition was taken before me at 8 the time and place therein set forth; 9 That the witness was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; 10 and that the testimony of the witness and all objections 11 12 made at the time of the examination were recorded by voice recognition by me, and thereafter transcribed under my 13 14 direction; 15 That the foregoing transcript is a true record of the testimony given by the witness and of all objections made 16 at the time of the examination, to the best of my ability. I further certify that I am in no way related to any 17 party to this matter nor to any of counsel, nor do I have any interest in the matter. 18 Witness my hand and seal this the 8th day of May, 2006. 19 20 CARL T. BECK, Notary 21 Public in and for the State 22 Of Washington, residing at 23 King. Commission expires 24 June 26, 2007 25